



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

AS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,779	07/27/2001	Ronald J. Skrzyniarz	1945.BDM	8792

7590

10/30/2002

Cynthia L. Foulke
NATIONAL STARCH AND CHEMICAL COMPANY
10 Finnerne Avenue
Bridgewater, NJ 08807-0500

EXAMINER

CHANG, VICTOR S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 10/30/2002

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/916,779

Applicant(s)

SKRZYNIARZ ET AL.

Examiner

Victor S Chang

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19 and 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-18, drawn to a foamed adhesive and an article comprising the foamed article, classified in class 428, subclass 304.4.
- II. Claims 19-20, drawn to a method for bonding materials together, classified in class 156, subclass 60+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

2. Inventions Group II and Group I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product, such as an un-foamed article.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. During a telephone conversation with Cynthia Foulke on 10/25/2002 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-18.

Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Art Unit: 1771

Claims 19-20 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37

CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 2, 10, 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

For claims 2 and 13, the grammar is vague and indefinite. It is not clear on which material the volume is based upon, clarification is requested. Additionally, claim 13 is de facto a duplicate of claim 2.

For claims 10 and 17, it appears that the claims should be more appropriately written in Markush format.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-2, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mudge (US 4692366).

Art Unit: 1771

Mudge's invention is related to a foamed adhesive comprising a vinyl acetate copolymer, and the adhesive may be foamed using equipment readily available for foaming compositions. This is accomplished by beating air or another gas into the latex composition until a uniform foam having the desired foam cell size and body is obtained. The volume of the latex composition is increased from about 2 to 10 times its original volume by the foaming or frothing process (Abstract and column 5, lines 33-38).

Claims lack novelty.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 3-10, 12 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mudge (US 4692366) either individually or in view of Murphy et al. (US 4036673) for claims 3-8.

The teachings of Mudge are again relied upon as set forth above.

For claims 3-4 and 14, Mudge does not specifically teach the use of an emulsion of homopolymer of polyvinyl acetate or a blend of polyvinyl acetates. However, it is believed that preparing a suitable foamed adhesive of polyvinyl acetate emulsion is within the skill of the art. Alternatively, Murphy's patent is related to a foamed adhesive

Art Unit: 1771

for installing a sheet of surface covering (Abstract). Murphy teaches that emulsions of polyvinyl acetate homopolymers, and copolymers are particularly suitable foamable adhesives (column 3, lines 51-55). As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Murphy's teachings to modify Mudge's foamable adhesive, motivated by the desire to use a readily available adhesive.

With respect to product-by-process claim 5, Applicant must show that the resultant article is patentably distinct from those taught by the reference.

For claims 6-9 and 15-16, Mudge teaches that up to 50 percent acetylated, casein, hydroxyethyl starch, carboxymethyl cellulose, gum arabic, and the like, as known in the art of synthetic emulsion polymer technology can be used in formulating the foamable adhesive (column 4, lines 1-5).

For claim 10 and 17, Mudge teaches that additives including auxiliary foaming agents, foam stabilizers, UV absorbers, etc., may also be present (column 3, lines 64-68).

For claims 12 and 18, the Examiner takes Official notice that it is well known that a wood composite, such as a particleboard, is commonly used in making a laminated countertop.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. In addition, the following references are cited of interest for making particleboards with foamed adhesives:

US 5324590 to Nylund et al.

US 4561918 to Scharfenberg et al.

Art Unit: 1771

EP 0789735 to Ward, et al.

WO 98/31764 to Viikari et al.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor S Chang whose telephone number is 703-605-4296. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel H Morris can be reached on 703-308-2414. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

VSC

VSC

October 28, 2002

DANIEL ZIRKER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1300-
1700

Daniel Zinker